

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in the present application.

Specification

The disclosure has been objected to because the proposed amendment to the specification filed on 03/05/09 does not contain entire paragraph 67.

In view of this, the specification has been amended in a proper format to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyon (US 2002/0077135) in view of Baker (USP 6,546,417) and further in view of Ostermann et al. (USP 6,990,452). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim:

said image transforming means scales up/down said registered image to adjust a height of said registered image to a height of said text, by referring only to the height of said text, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that the height of said registered image matches the height of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a horizontal writing, and to adjust a width of said registered image to a width of said text, by referring only to the width of said text, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that the width of said registered image matches the width of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a vertical writing, the height and widths of said registered image inserted in the text being adjusted to the height and width of said text before the registered image is displayed. (*emphasis added*)

Claims 6, 7, 8 have been amended in a similar manner.

Further, Claim 18 has been amended to claim:

said image transforming means scales up/down said registered image to adjust a size of said registered image to a size of said text in accordance only with a dimension of said character in a the direction orthogonal to the arrangement of the texts, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that a height of said registered image matches a height of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a horizontal writing, and a width of said registered image matches a width of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a vertical writing, the size of said registered image inserted in the text being adjusted to the size of said text before the registered image is displayed. (*emphasis added*)

Claim 19 has been amended in a similar manner.

The “the size of said registered image inserted in the text being adjusted to the size of said text before the registered image is displayed” limitation is disclosed in page 11, lines 27-28 of the specification.

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action, the Examiner refers the Baker reference, which states “the icon most closely matching the point size of the font is chosen and then scaled as needed to better match the font point size,” and alleges that “because Baker scales the icon to a size (i.e. length AND width) of a respective text font, [than] as a result the claimed heights and width of the image is adjusted to the heights and width to match any requisite text font.” The Examiner also acknowledges that “Baker’s method always scales both the length and the height . . .”

The Examiner also alleges that the Hyon reference teaches using both horizontal and vertical writing systems.

In view of this, although the Hyon reference may disclose the use of horizontal and vertical writing systems, the Baker reference merely discloses matching the size of an icon that most closely matches the point size of the font (it is known in the art that a font of each point size has predetermined height and width) and scaling both the length and the height to better match the font size.

In contrast, in the claimed invention of the present application, the registered image is scaled up/down “to adjust a height of said registered image to a height of said text, by referring only to the height of said text, . . . when displaying a horizontal writing,” and “to adjust a width of said registered image to a width of said text, by referring only to the width of said text, when displaying a vertical writing,” as recited in claim 1. In other words, the claimed invention of the present application does not refer to the “point size of the font,” but refers only to the height of the text when displaying the horizontal writing and refers only to the width of the text when displaying the vertical writing.

In view of this, even assuming that Hyon, Baker, and Ostermann can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, one skilled in the art would, at best, modify Hyon, which shows using both horizontal and vertical writing systems, choosing an icon most closely matching the point size of the font for both horizontal and vertical writing, and further modify Hyon in view of Baker by allowing the icon to be sandwiched between two parts of the text, and would not conceive the claimed feature of claim 1.

Further, although Baker states, in col. 8, lines 25-28:

According to the presently preferred embodiment, icons are stored as small image files, e.g. EPS files or GIF files, and are pointed to by the TYPETABLE data structure. . . .
(*emphasis added*),

Baker fails to disclose or suggest “the height and widths of said registered image inserted in the text being adjusted to the height and width of said text before the registered image is displayed,” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 3-5 and 9-14, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 6, 7, 8 are also allowable at least for the reasons stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

Claim 15, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

Claim 16, dependent on claim 7, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 7.

Claim 17, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

Claim 18 is allowable at least because Hyon in view of Baker would, at best, disclose scaling the icon up/down to adjust a size of the icon to a size of the text in accordance with dimensions of the font in height and width directions (i.e., the font point size), and does not disclose or suggest scaling “up/down said registered image to adjust a size of said registered image to a size of said text in accordance only with a dimension of said character in a the direction orthogonal to the arrangement of the texts,” as recited in claim 18.

Claim 19 is also allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 18.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.


In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi, Reg. No. 40,417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

per By  (reg. # 40,417)
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant